

16 Warren Park
West Hill
Ottery St Mary
EX11 1TN

5th February 2013

My family formally lived in Glastonbury, Somerset - one of the first towns in England to be covered with Wi-Fi transmitters. The Town Council believed the introduction of Wi-Fi broadband to Glastonbury would enhance business and improve tourism. It failed on this score so they wasted their £33k investment, but more significantly it caused immediate health problems for inhabitants in the town.

I was one of the people affected by these masts. I am a Nutritionist and at the time I ran my clinic from my home which was located 50 yards away from one of the Wi-Fi masts. My exposure was consequently 24/7. After a few months, I started to suffer with constant migraine, insomnia, loss of memory and brain fog. It took many months for me to establish and confirm the reasons for my ill health. As a Nutritionist I was able to work with the British Society of Ecological Medicine and a private laboratory to document the cell changes that were happening when I was exposed to the electromagnetic radiation. This ultimately allowed me to confirm the cause and effect. I have now moved away, but remain sensitised to electromagnetic radiation, cannot earn a living and must live a reclusive life.

Whilst initially my experience and that of fellow sufferers might have been put down to anecdotal evidence, hard facts are now starting to emerge:

In May 2011, the World Health Organisation (WHO)/ IARC classified all RFR as a Possible Human Carcinogen (2B classification), i.e. radiation emitted by base-station antennas, radio/TV towers, radar, Wi-Fi and smart meters. I have a letter from Rt Hon J Hunt stating that the Government has dismissed this report as not worthy of action since the effects found were 'limited to glioma and acoustic neuroma'!

In the same month, the Council of Europe recommended that restrictions be put on the use of mobile phones and access to the internet (via Wi-Fi) in all schools across the continent to protect young children from harmful radiation.

Medical organisations throughout the world have since joined these authorities in voicing their concerns: The American Academy of Environmental Medicine has called for a precautionary approach to wireless technologies. The Austrian Medical Association is opposed to the use of mobile phones or Wi-Fi in schools and has recently called for wireless smart meters not to be used in Austria. The Swiss Doctors for Environmental Protection have recently called for caution with respect to wireless technologies.

Despite the ground swell of opinion, the HPA, in association with The Advisory Group on Non-Ionising Radiation (AGNIR), recently released their document, 'Health Effects from Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Fields'. The summary of this report is upbeat, but misses the evidence of biological damage presented within its own report.

For example, the report presents 23 male fertility studies. 18 of these, or **78%**, cite ***decreased male fertility and/or damage to sperm***. In other words, they show clear evidence of adverse biological health effects and damage to reproductive function.

Similarly, other adverse effects reported are:

*Page 86: Cellular studies ... show **potential genotoxic effects***

*Page 87: Authors suggested that the exposure to an RF field had **affected DNA repair mechanisms**.*

*Page 103: In general, **most studies report finding effects on cell membranes***

*Page 105: In general, most of the studies that have investigated changes in protein function or structure due to exposure to RF fields **have found effects**.*

*Page 136: Studies investigating cellular physiology have produced some evidence to **suggest that low level exposures are capable of causing measurable biological changes**.*

Further, the updated BioInitiative (2012) report <http://www.bioinitiative.org/>

contains 1800 new studies and states that the evidence for risk to health from electromagnetic fields and wireless technologies has substantially increased since 2007. It **concludes that we now have far more evidence than is necessary to require us to immediately take precautionary action to protect ourselves, our children and all life of the planet.**

These new scientific studies tell us that the situation is much worse than previously thought. Exposures are linked to a variety of adverse health outcomes that may have significant public health consequences. Overall, there is reinforced scientific evidence of risk where there is chronic exposure to low-intensity electromagnetic fields and to wireless technologies for many hours a day – i.e typical of the hours children spend in school.

The range of possible health effects associated with chronic exposures has broadened. The most serious health endpoints that have been reported include leukaemia, brain tumours, leakage of the blood-brain barrier and increased risk of the neurodegenerative diseases, Alzheimer's and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS).

Rather than reducing concerns or providing actual indications of safety, recent studies largely reinforce the potential risks to health.

All of this considerable research is running well behind the rapid and ubiquitous roll out of wifi technologies and microwave radiation and, given the latency lag of up to 20 years for some cancers, it is too late to simply watch and wait.

Clearly the evidence for biological damage resulting from our exposure is clear and levels should be immediately lowered if public health is to be protected.

Yours sincerely

JULIA TAYLOR